

devices in contrast perform, for example, graphics calculations for objects such as lighting calculations, texture calculations and other calculations to generate display images from graphics information (and can also process video information). The modules in Normile do not perform such graphics operations but are merely video compression and decompression modules. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance for this reason alone.

In addition, claim 1 requires that a first video port is coupled to an output of both the first and second graphics devices. The office action cites the bus 425 of Normile as corresponding to the claimed first video output port. However, a bus is not a video output port. For example, as noted in Applicant's Figures and Specification, FIG. 1 shows the system bus which is different from the video ports 151 and 152. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a bus is not a video output port as claimed and accordingly, Normile fails to anticipate the claim for this reason as well.

With respect to claim 18, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above. Accordingly, this claim is also allowable.

Claims 30, 31, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor. Taylor is directed to a system and method for memory mapping and display control wherein, among other things, each display control unit of a plurality of control units is assigned the responsibility for controlling display data of a respective region of a single screen of a display device. For example, in FIG. 2a, the single display screen is divided into twelve non-overlapping regions. Accordingly, the Taylor system does not control each display control unit to generate entire frames of information, but instead is a sub-frame based system that divides a single frame into subsections for each display control unit.

In contrast, claim 30 is directed to a multiple graphics device wherein each graphics device renders a frame of video and the device includes a common port that receives the first and second frames of the rendered video from either of the first and second graphics devices.

Accordingly, a frame based processing apparatus is claimed. Taylor teaches a different approach. Accordingly, this claim is in condition for allowance. Dependent claim 31 is allowable at least as depending upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 38 and 39 are also in condition for allowance. For example, claim 39 requires that the rendered frames are adjacent frames of video. However, the cited portion of Taylor again does not teach the claimed subject matter since the cited portion refers to subsections of a frame that are generated by each display control unit and as such, adjacent frames of video are not provided by each of the display control units. Accordingly, this claim is in condition for allowance.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jordan in view of Gonsalves. Jordan is directed to a multiple screen video adapter with television tuner that utilizes two graphics user interface accelerators and two television tuners. Video data is output from the graphics accelerators to separate monitors through separate nodes.

In contrast, claim 19 requires, among other things, providing the first signal to the first node and providing the second signal of the second device to the first node. As such, both signals are provided to the same node. In contrast, the output component signals in Jordan are output to two different displays via different output nodes. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance for this reason alone.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jordan in view of Gonsalves and further in view of Krenik. Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is allowable at least as depending upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jordan in view of Gonsalves and further in view of Davis. Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is allowable at least as depending upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Normile in view of Taylor. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 regarding the Normile reference and as such, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

In addition, Taylor has been cited as teaching rendering a frame of video and providing the rendered frame to the video output port and wherein the second graphics device renders an adjacent frame of video and provides the adjacent frame to the same video output port. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to Taylor again noting that Taylor does not teach frame base rendering an output but instead teaches sub-frame base rendering and dividing a display of frame into twelve subsections. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

Claim 32 is allowable at least as depending upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37 are also allowable at least as depending upon an allowable base claim and also as adding additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/17/05

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005